Comment on "Fission Mass Widths in ^{19}F + ^{232}Th, ^{16}O + ^{235,238} U reactions at near barrier energies"

T. K. Ghosh and P.Bhattacharya

Saha Institute of Nuclear Physics, 1/AF Bidhan Nagar, Kolkata 700 064, India

(Dated: February 8, 2008)

arXiv:nucl-ex/0505019v1 15 May 2005

Abstract

A critical re-analysis of the experimental data to reject transfer fission component did not change the fragment mass widths and hence the conclusion regarding abrupt rise in mass widths with decreasing energy around Coulomb barrier remains unchanged.

PACS numbers: 25.70.Jj

In a recent Rapid Communication R. Yanez et al [1] reported the variations of the widths of mass distributions with energy contradicting the trend of increase in widths with decreasing energy reported by the present authors [2] for the system ^{19}F + ^{232}Th and concluded that the difference could be due to incomplete separation of the transfer fission (TF) from fusion-fission (FF) by the present authors.

We had employed the separation of FF from the distribution of events on polar (θ) and azimuthal angles (ϕ). In a re-analysis of the experimental data at a center of mass energy of 85.3 MeV (shown in Fig. 1), both the procedures do not show any significant difference of the contours of the FF events (shown by rectangles). In table I, we have shown the events used to calculate the variance of the mass distributions using both gates in angles and velocities of the fissioning system. In fact, in all energies, the coincidance gates on θ - ϕ are more compact, excluding more TF events than in the correlation of velocities of the fissioning system.



FIG. 1: Distributions of complementary fission fragments in θ-ϕ (upper panel) and V_{par}-V_{perp} (lower panel). The contour represents the gate used to select the fusion fission events.

It may also be noted that we had used a much smaller azimuthal ($\sim 12^{\circ}$) coverage in our detectors, hence the events from TF with large out of plane velocities are rejected by detector geometry. The corresponding mass widths are also shown, and no large differences

from our earlier analysis [2] are observed which can explain the observed variation of about 4 a.m.u. in mass widths as shown in fig. 2.

It may be noted that we had used long flight paths of about 52 cm and used *difference* of time of flights to eliminate systematic worsening of mass resolutions due to pulse beam time structure and variations of machine time delays with energies to obtain a good mass resolution of about 3 a.m.u [3]. Effects of multiple scattering in target on mass widths are also reduced. Use of *ratios* of fragment velocities to find masses considerably worsens the mass resolution even in our experimental arrangement to about 11 a.m.u [3] , and can be presumed to be considerably worsened in small flight paths of 18 cm used by Yanez *et al.,* [1]. This is a significant difference between the two experimental procedure and may lead to washing out the small difference in mass widths for both the thick and thin targets as reported in [1].



FIG. 2: Variance of the mass distribution for the fission fragments following fusion fission as function of beam energy for the ^{19}F + ^{232}Th reaction.

[1] R. Yanez *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **71** 041602(R) (2005).

[2] T.K. Ghosh *et al.*, Phys. Rev. C **69** 031603(R) (2004).

[3] T.K. Ghosh *et al.*, Nucl. Instrum. Methods Phys. Res. A **540** 285 (2005).

TABLE I: Gated events used to calculate the mass variance

E_{cm}	Events with in gate θ, ϕ	Events with in gate V_{par}, V_{perp}
MeV	%	%
97.5	87	88
93.8	81	86
89.1	77	85
87.1	75	84
85.3	74	79
77.8	42	49